

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/980,809	RUDOLPH, DIETMAR	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alexander Jamal	2614	

All Participants:
Status of Application: non-final rejected

 (1) Alexander Jamal.

(3) _____.

 (2) Erik R. Swanson (40833).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 9 November 2007
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner noted newly discovered prior art and asked applicant to show specification enablement for the terms "multi-stage modulator, internet, automatic switchover, frequency prognosis, database storage" which were used in the claims. Applicant stated that all the terms are well known terms and that it would have been obvious to apply those known concepts to applicant's claimed invention. Examiner noted that he would read each of those terms as being obvious to apply any of those terms to any invention or system in the same field.